REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The arguments and amendments presented herein include the arguments and amendments Applicants discussed with the Examiner during phone interview dated July 31, 2008. The Examiner requested Applicants to submit the discussed arguments and amendments for reconsideration, which Applicants present herein. Applicants submit that the arguments and amendments presented herein make the substance of the phone interview of record to comply with 37 CFR 1.133. If the Examiner believes that further information on the interview needs to be made of record to comply with the requirements, Applicants request the Examiner to identify such further information.

In this Amendment, Applicants have amended claims and cancelled non-method claims 21-30 and 39 from further consideration in this application. Applicants are not conceding that the subject matter encompassed by claims prior to this Amendment is not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner. Claims were amended and cancelled in this Amendment solely to facilitate expeditious prosecution of the pending claims. Applicant respectfully reserves the right to pursue claims, including the subject matter encompassed by claims, as presented prior to this Amendment and additional claims in one or more continuing applications.

1.   Claims 31-34 are Patentable Over the Cited Art

The Examiner rejected claims 31-34 as obvious (35 U.S.C. §103(a)) over Schneide3r (U.S. Patent No. 6,785,728) in view of Ross (U.S. Patent No. 6,629,135). Applicants traverse with respect to the amended claims.

Amended claim 31 recites a method comprising: receiving a call request from a user to execute an object; determining an access authority for the user; acquiring an object access authority set for the object indicating access authorities for methods called by the object; comparing the user access authority and the object access authority set to determine whether the user access authority permits access to the methods called by the object; and searching a storage section storing execution results for a previous execution of the object prior to executing the call request and in response to determining that the user access authority permits access to the method called by the object.

Applicants amended claim 31 to recite acquiring an object access authority set for the object indicating access authorities for methods called by the object and comparing the user

access authority and the object access authority set to determine whether the user access authority permits access to the methods called by the object. These added requirements are disclosed on at least pg. 6, line 5 to pg. 7, line 2, pg. 15, lines 23-27, pg. 20, lines 15-21, FIG. 15, pg. 23, line 25 to pg. 24, line 15 of the Specification. Applicants further removed the reading the access authority and determining whether the access authority is contained in the access authority set limitations.

With respect to the preamended claims, the Examiner cited col. 9, lines 40-65, col. 10, lines 1-30, FIG. 3, and col. 26, lines 27-40 of Schneider with respect to determining the access authority of the user is contained in the access authority set of the user. (Office Action, pgs. 18, 20) Applicants traverse with respect to the amended claim 31.

The cited cols. 9 and 10 discusses access control for a database. The database responds to an access request identifying a user and an information resource. The request is granted if the user belongs to a user group which may access the information set of the information resource and the request has a trust level. A sensitivity level indicates the trust level required to access a resource.

Although the cited cols. 9 and 10 discuss trust levels to access an information resource, this does not teach the claimed object access authority set for the object indicating access authorities for methods called by the object and comparing the user access authority and the object access authority set to determine whether the user access authority permits access to the methods called by the object. Instead, the cited cols. 9 and 10 discuss a trust level of an information resource in a database, not whether a user access authority permits the user access to methods called by the object called by the user.

The cited col. 26 mentions that lets a user sort a Resource List by information sets, locations or services. The user may specify the sort and the order in which the categories are used in the sort. The interface further has a search function in which the user enters a search string, and the resource list and descriptions of resources are searched in the orders specified. The first match is displayed.

Although the cited col. 26 discusses allowing a search of resources and sort, this discussion of the user may sort a resource list and information sets, there is no teaching of an object access authority set for the object indicating access authorities for methods called by the

object and comparing the user access authority and the object access authority set to determine whether the user access authority permits access to the methods called by the object.

The Examiner further cited col. 5, lines 56-61 of Ross with respect to the pre-amended claim 31. (Office Action, pg. 20) Applicants traverse with respect to the amended claim 31.

The cited col. 5 of Ross mentions an object cache containing responses to previously submitted requests. Items in the cache have an expiration time. The cache reduces the load on the application tier.

Although the col. 5 discusses caching responses to previous requests, there is no teaching of caching execution results for previous execution of the object and searching a storage section or cache for previous execution results if the user access authority permits the user access to the methods called by the object. Instead, the cited col. 5 discusses an object cache containing objects, but does not teach that the cache has execution results for a called object as claimed.

Accordingly, amended claim 31 is patentable over the cited art because the cited combination of Schneider and Ross do not teach or suggest the combination of claim requirements.

Claims 32-34 are patentable over the cited art because they depend from amended claim 31, which is patentable over the cited art for the reasons discussed above. Moreover, the following dependent claims provide additional grounds of patentability over the cited art.

Claim 33 depends from claim 31 and further requires transmitting the execution results for the previous execution of the object prior to executing the call request with respect to the object in response to determining that the storage section stores the execution results for the previous execution of the object subject to the call request.

The Examiner cited col. 5, lines 56-61 of Ross as teaching the additional requirements of claim 33. (Office Action, pg. 22) Applicants traverse.

The cited col. 5 mentions an object cache containing responses to previously submitted requests. Items in the cache have an expiration time. The cache reduces the load on the application tier.

Although the col. 5 discusses caching responses to a previous request, there is no teaching of transmitting execution results for previous execution of the object prior to executing the object. Instead, the cited col. 5 discusses an object cache containing objects, but does not teach that the cache is used to transmit execution results for a called object as claimed.

Accordingly, claim 33 provides additional grounds of patentability over the cited art because the cited combination of Schneider and Ross do not teach or suggest the additional requirements of claim 33.

Claim 34 depends from claim 31 and further requires passing the call request to an object executor in response to determining that the storage section does not store execution results for the previous execution of the object subject to the call request.

The Examiner cited the above discussed cols. 9 and 10 of Schneider as teaching the additional requirements of claim 34. (Office Action, pgs. 23-24) Applicants traverse.

The cited cols. 9 and 10 discusses access control for database. The database responds to an access request identifying a user and an information resource. The request is granted if the user belongs to a user group which may access the information set of the information resource and the request has a trust level. A sensitivity level indicates the trust level required to access a resource.

Nowhere do the cited cols. 9 and 10 teach or suggest passing a call result to an object executor if the storage does not store the execution results for the previous execution of the object that is called. The cited cols. 9 and 10 discuss trust levels for information in a database, and do not teach or mention executing an object if the storage does not store execution results for the object that is called.

Accordingly, claim 34 provides additional grounds of patentability over the cited art because the cited combination of Schneider and Ross do not teach or suggest the additional requirements of claim 34.

2.   Added Claims 40-46

Added claim 40 depends from claim 31, and further requires determining methods called by the object; determining an access authority for each determined method; generating the object access authority set to comprise the determined access authorities of the determined methods, wherein the object access authority set indicates access authorities needed to execute the determined methods.

The added requirements of claim 40 are disclosed on at least page 16, lines 1-34, pg 18, lines 3-20; FIGs. 11 and 12, pg. 22, line 15 to pg. 23, line 24 of the Specification.

Added claim 41 depends from claim 31 and further requires that determining the access authority for each determined method calling additional methods comprises determining the access authorities of the additional methods called by the method, wherein the object access authority set for the method additionally includes the determined access authorities of the additional methods called by the method.

The added requirements of claim 41 are disclosed on at least pg. 21, line 15 to pg. 22, line 2 of the Specification.

Added claim 42 depends from 40 and further requires that access to the execution results is not granted to the user if the access authority for one determined method is unknown.

The added requirements of claim 41 are disclosed on at least pg. 22, lines 4-15 of the Specification.

Added claim 43 depends from claim 42 and further requires that the object is executed even if access to the execution results is not granted.

The added requirements of claim 41 are disclosed on at least pg. 22, lines 4-15 of the Specification.

Added claim 44 depends from claim 34, and further comprising: storing execution results from the object executor in response to executing the object of the call request with the access authority set for the object and an object name.

The added requirements of claim 44 are disclosed on at least pg. 19, lines 20-25 of the Specification.

Added claim 45 depends from claim 34 and further requires returning the execution results to the user having user access authority permitting access to the object.

The added requirements of claim 45 are disclosed on at least pg. 24, lines 25-30 of the Specification.

Added claim 46 depends from claim 31, and further requires receiving a subsequent call request for the object from the user and returning the execution results to the user in response to determining that the execution results are associated with the user without comparing the user access control to the object access authority.

The added requirements of claim 41 are disclosed on at least pg. 26, lines 20-30 of the Specification.

Applicants submit that added claims 40-46 are patentable over the cited art because they depend from base claim 31, which is patentable over the cited art for the reasons discussed above and because the additional requirements of these claims in combination with the base and intervening claims provide further grounds of patentability over the cited art.

Conclusion

For all the above reasons, Applicant submits that the pending claims 31-34 and 40-46 are patentable. Should any additional fees be required beyond those paid, please charge Deposit Account No. 09-0460.

The attorney of record invites the Examiner to contact him at (310) 553-7977 if the Examiner believes such contact would advance the prosecution of the case.

Dated: August 1, 2008   By:___/David Victor/_____

                                                                   David W. Victor
                                                                   Registration No. 39,867

Please direct all correspondences to:

David W. Victor
Konrad Raynes & Victor, LLP
315 South Beverly Drive, Ste. 210
Beverly Hills, CA 90212
Tel: (310) 553-7977
Fax: 310-556-7984